



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

JK

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/747,633	12/29/2003	Steven J. Demopoulos	G&C 30566.103-US-C1	5734

7590 11/03/2004

Attn: Jason S. Feldmar
Gates & Cooper LLP
Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, CA 90045

EXAMINER

SHAH, SANJIV

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/747,633	DEMOPoulos ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sanjiv D. Shah	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/29/2003.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: ____ .

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-18 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,675,355. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims are broader. All the limitations are covered by the patented claims. The only difference is that some patented features are not claimed in the instant claims.

It would have been obvious for a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide annotation or redline document with limited features as described in Patent # 6,675,355 because it aids in displaying the documents with annotations thus providing broader coverage.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (Patent # 6,480,865) in view of Schilit et al. (Patent # 6,279,041).

Regarding claims 1, 7, 13, Lee et al. teaches a method of annotating (which is equivalent to redlining/marking) the XML document as described in the abstract, line 1. Accessing RedlineXML document (fig 2, element 202) that confirms to RedlineXML schema (col. 2, lines 10-19), wherein the schema identifies the structure of the XML document (col. 2, lines 17-20) comprising:

A base document element that identifies a base document (col. 5, lines 1-5, & fig. 2, element 206) and

Object element comprising one or more attributes for displaying markup object (fig 2, element 210, col. 2, lines 37-44, col. 5, lines 60-col. 6, lines 15, wherein the Java class object comprises one or more attributes for markup object).

Lee et al teaches a method of reading objects and documents from computer but fails to specifically teach a displaying device displaying the redline or annotation markup on the base document in accordance with object elements and attributes. Schilit et al. does.

Specifically Schilit et al. teaches displaying annotations according to attributes as shown in fig 2, element S160.

Therefore it would have been obvious for a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to display redline or annotations in the method of Lee et al. because it provides flexible organization of material without adding to the effort of reading and note taking as described by Schilit et al. (col. 3, lines 20-25).

Regarding claims 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, Lee et al. teaches object element specifying constraints (col. 2, lines 17-20) and attributes (col. 2, lines 37-44) for drawing redline object.

Regarding claims 5, 11, 17 Lee et al. teaches the claimed invention of object element being markup plane and XML document identifying the plane as described in col. 4, lines 42-48 and col. 5, lines 1-4.

Regarding claims 6, 12, 18, parsing the document are taught by Lee et al. (col. 2, lines 12-15). Displaying the document is taught by Schilit et al. (fig 2, element S160).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sanjiv D. Shah whose telephone number is (571) 272-4098. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Sanjiv D. Shah
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2176

S. Shah
October 31, 2004